

TRIBUTE TO SISTER HELEN COSTELLO, RSCJ RECIPIENT OF THE 2003 ST. MADELEINE SOPHIE BARAT AWARD

### HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 18, 2003

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sister Helen Costello, RSCJ, a distinguished Californian, as she receives the 2003 St. Madeleine Sophie Barat Award. This award, named for the foundress of the Society of the Religious of the Sacred Heart, honors individuals who over a significant period of time have made extraordinary contributions to Sacred Heart Schools, Atherton. Founded in 1897, Sacred Heart Schools includes St. Joseph's School of the Sacred Heart and Sacred Heart Preparatory.

Sister Helen Costello was born in San Francisco and entered the 8th grade at the Convent of the Sacred Heart in 1929, which was then a boarding school for girls. Sister Costello graduated from Sacred Heart School in 1935 and took her final vows in Rome in 1949. She taught at St. Joseph's School from the early 1950's until 1967. During that time she was responsible for overseeing the altar boys, some of whom still keep in touch with her. Since leaving the School, Sister Costello has worked with the Handicapped, assisted children with cancer, and counseled students. Throughout the years, Sister Costello has dedicated her time and talents to the students and families of Sacred Heart School.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to honor her work, her values, and her deep love for her students and I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Sister Helen Costello, RSCJ, as she receives the 2003 St. Madeleine Sophie Barat Award for her extraordinary contributions to Sacred Heart Schools.

### REINTRODUCTION OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE REVIEW BILL

### HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 18, 2003

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, for some time, I have believed that it is essential to transform our military so that the United States is better able to deal with the enormous security challenges of the 21st century. Since my first term in Congress, I have worked to develop a more flexible, adaptable military with a "culture of innovation" that will ensure that our security is protected as the threats against us, our allies, and our values grow in number and complexity. But at the same time, I recognize that American national security does not rest solely on the shoulders of the U.S. military.

Based on my work in defense transformation, I became convinced that homeland security was a vital area requiring not just more money, but a major reorganization of the government agencies charged with protecting the American homeland. I introduced the first bill creating a new organization to better protect the homeland on March 21, 2001, and that new Department is now up and running.

I also believe that a transformation is needed at the Department of State so that it is bet-

ter able to formulate and implement American foreign policy in the coming years. On September 18, 1998, I introduced H.R. 4065 in the 105th Congress to require that an independent, non-partisan panel review all the facts and functions of the Department of State and to provide Congress with its findings and with a plan for reorganizing the Department. The bill was reintroduced as H.R. 106 in the 106th Congress and as H.R. 304 in the 107th Congress.

I believe that the events of the past two years only add a greater degree of urgency to the need for such a transformation. It is time for Congress to take action.

The gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Snyder, has also been working on these issues for some time. He has suggested a number of improvements in my previous proposals, and today we are introducing the revised version of the bill. It does not prescribe in legislative language exactly how the Department of State should be reorganized despite the many studies and reports which have recommended various actions. It does establish the framework for a serious study of all of the recommendations and requires that a proposal be submitted to Congress. We would then have to act upon the legislation in the normal order.

There have been a number of outside studies which recommend reform in very strong terms. For example, in January 2001, a study cosponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations and the Center for Strategic and International Studies and chaired by former Secretary of Defense and career foreign service officer, Frank Carlucci, issued "a scathing report," warning that "the United States will soon face serious dangers and enormous costs because its foreign policy establishment has not come to terms with global changes a full decade after the Cold War ended." (Los Angeles Times, January 30, 2001). "No government bureaucracy is in greater need of reform than the Department of State," the report found.

In March 2001, the United States Commission on National Security/21st Century, better known as the Hart-Rudman Commission, found that "The Department of State is a crippled institution that is starved for resources by Congress because of its inadequacies and is thereby weakened further. The department suffers in particular from an ineffective organizational structure in which regional and functional goals compete, and in which sound management, accountability, and leadership are lacking (p. 47)." Other studies and reports have reached similar conclusions.

This bill requires a serious study of the organization of the Department of State and our diplomatic structure. The Commission created by the bill will examine all levels of the Department, from the organization chart of bureaus and offices to staffing at embassies around the world. It will also look at issues such as public diplomacy—whether we are organized to wage the battle over ideas, which is so critical to the ultimate success of the war on terrorism—and use of foreign assistance—whether we are prepared to use effectively innovative new programs, such as the Millennium Challenge Account.

There may be a variety of opinions on what the Department of State should be doing and on exactly what organizational and process changes should be made, but we should all be able to agree that how decisions are made,

and especially how they are implemented, needs drastic improvement.

Mr. Speaker, change is always difficult, and we should not impose change without a good reason for doing so. We also have an obligation, I think, to seek better, more effective ways to advance American interests, and no Department should be exempt from penetrating examination in pursuit of those larger interests.

### INTRODUCTION OF THE VIDEO CONSUMER PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT OF 2003

### HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 18, 2003

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Video Programming Consumer Privacy Protection Act of 2003. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation's communications networks continue to grow and become ever more sophisticated, more individuals and industries will be using broadband networks at home and work. As America upgrades its communications infrastructure for the 21st century, we must make sure that the information superhighway is safe for all its travelers and this is particularly true with respect to personal privacy.

As the co-chair of the Congressional Privacy Caucus, along with Representative JOE BARTON (R-TX), I have been concerned about protecting privacy and closing anachronistic or technology-specific loopholes in consumer privacy protections for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly apparent that, in addition to the protections accorded consumers with respect to information gathered by cable operators, video rental stores, and telecommunications carriers, which are contained in current law, further protections are needed to ensure that consumer privacy rights are retained and respected on the information superhighway by other entities. This includes entities with access to consumer video information, or who are using other technologies to essentially deliver similar services to those covered by current law.

This is especially the case in the video marketplace. Current law contains privacy protections for consumers when they rent video cassettes—as contained in the Video Privacy Protection Act of 1988, codified at 18 U.S.C. 2710—or subscribe to cable or other services from a cable operator, as contained in the Communications Act of 1934 47 U.S.C. 551.

Since the privacy provisions protecting cable subscribers were put in place in 1984, the Direct Broadcast Satellite industry has developed. Today, Echostar and DirecTV, for example, have approximately 20 million subscribers. Although they offer multichannel video programming across the country in a manner comparable to many cable operators, current legal privacy protections protect cable subscribers but not satellite subscribers. This makes absolutely no sense when one considers that millions of such satellite subscribers are watching the same programming as the cable subscriber next door. Consumers who switch from cable to satellite service often do not know that the privacy protections the law accords them in one market do not follow them when they switch technologies even